UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA CHARLOTTE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	DOCKET NO.	3:21-CR-34-2
VS.	į		
JALEN JUWAN JACKSON,)		
Defendant.)		
)		

TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE KENNETH D. BELL UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SEPTEMBER 14, 2022

APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of the Government:

ERIK LINDAHL, ESQ. United States Attorney's Office 227 West Trade Street, Suite 1700 Charlotte, North Carolina 28202

On Behalf of the Defendant:

JOHN PARKE DAVIS, ESQ. Federal Public Defender's Office 129 West Trade Street, Suite 300 Charlotte, North Carolina 28202

> Cheryl A. Nuccio, RMR-CRR Official Court Reporter United States District Court Charlotte, North Carolina

2.0

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: The next matter is United States versus Jalen Jackson, docket number 3:21-cr-34.

Mr. Jackson, you pled guilty before a magistrate judge on June 17, 2021, at a plea and Rule 11 hearing in which you answered questions under oath; and based on your answers, the magistrate judge found that your plea was knowingly and voluntarily made and he accepted your plea. No objections were filed to the findings of the magistrate judge and this Court will adopt them as its own.

Do the parties stipulate that there is a factual basis for the plea and that the Court may rely on the offense conduct set forth in the presentence report to establish the factual basis?

MR. DAVIS: We do, Your Honor.

MR. LINDAHL: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Based on that stipulation, the offense conduct set forth in the presentence report, the defendant's plea of guilty before the magistrate judge, and the defendant's admissions, the Court finds that there is a factual basis for the plea.

Mr. Jackson, your case was referred to the U.S. Probation Office for preparation of a presentence investigation and report, which the Court has received and reviewed. Have you read that report?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

2.0

THE COURT: Do you understand what's in it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Have you had all the time you would like to discuss it with your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You may sit down.

Mr. Davis, I see several objections to the report.

MR. DAVIS: Yes, Your Honor. I think similar to the last hearing, we would be withdrawing the trafficking objection but maintaining the objection to the four-level in-connection-with, which the government is in accord with that. Separately we'll also withdraw the objections to the conditions of supervision which I believe are outdated at this point.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. DAVIS: I do think it is appropriate, and I'm open to the argument that perhaps this isn't the point in the proceeding to go into it but it is connected, to discuss the reliability of information that is in the presentence report, particularly in regard to a pending case and a dismissed case. I think there are serious issues with the reliability of that information and particularly the way that it was included in this particular PSR.

THE COURT: Do you want to challenge that now or just as part of your argument with respect to the 3553(a) factors?

MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, I do think the inclusion of it in the PSR is problematic; however, I'm not asking for it

2.1

MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, I do think the inclusion of it in the PSR is problematic; however, I'm not asking for it to be explicitly stricken, so I'm open to including that in the later argument if that's cleaner for the Court.

THE COURT: All right. Let's handle it that way if you're not seeking to have it changed in the presentence report.

So with those withdrawals and stipulations, it appears that before consideration of departure or variance, the guidelines provide for an offense level of 27, a criminal history category I, and an advisory range of 70 to 87 months.

Do the parties concur with that?

MR. DAVIS: We do, Your Honor.

MR. LINDAHL: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Then, Mr. Davis, I'd be glad to hear from you.

MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Your Honor.

As the Court can see, Mr. Jackson has a very low criminal history, criminal record at this point and a difficult background of neglect. He was homeless and on the streets at a very young age. His father was largely absent from his life in the early parts of his life, perhaps to his

benefit, frankly, but it was still difficult. When his mother entered a homeless shelter, he was, I believe, 13, 12 or 13. He was too old to be allowed into the women's shelter and so as a boy, essentially, was forced to live on the street for a while. It has not been an easy growing up for him, and yet he has still maintained a low criminal record up until these recent events.

12.

2.0

2.1

Based on all of that — and I'm going to jump to an elephant in the room here. Based on all of that, my intention originally was to come into this Court and argue for a downward variance. This time last week Mr. Lindahl, who himself had just received it, provided us with documents from the Mecklenburg County jail about incidents that occurred there which he has since filed with this Court. There is — I'm sure that we could have a lot of back and forth about individual incidents, but I think the bottom line here is those are serious. And as a general proposition, though there are certainly details he would very much quibble with, as a general proposition, Mr. Jackson acknowledges that his behavior there was, to say the least, less than ideal. I do, however, want to raise some things from that point.

The Court likely noted that that time frame ended at the end of March of this year as far as the incident report came in and that, I think — I believe it indicates on the document itself, I may be wrong about that, but that is

essentially the time where that document was created. So that doesn't capture anything that happened after that point.

My office — after speaking with Mr. Jackson, my office independently contacted the Mecklenburg County jail regarding anything after March 28, and I have obtained a copy of the incident reports from March 28 on that I'd like to hand up if I may. And I'll mark this as Defendant's Exhibit 1 which I have previously shown the government. And to minimize the back and forth, I also have a character letter. I'll just hand these up together.

(Documents tendered to the Court.)

(Court peruses documents.)

THE COURT: All right.

2.0

2.1

MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, I will note — first of all, I'll note, as the Court has just read, that from March until the present, the only incidents — quote, unquote, incidents he's involved in is one where — which basically just notes that he's gone off a fast and the other one where he is merely mentioned in what is an incident report for someone else that has no misconduct of his.

From approximately June 15 until August 9 he was transferred to the Irwin County Detention Center. My office contacted Irwin County Detention Center. They confirmed this morning that he had no disciplinary incidents down there.

We were also able to talk to a DART sergeant, which

I'm going to forget what that acronym stands for, but it's in the write-up somewhere, but DART Sergeant Patella. We were not able to — we were only able to talk to Sergeant Patella yesterday due to time constraints and the fact that they needed to — anything in writing has to go through their legal department. We were not able to get a letter, but I do have a summary of that conversation which I've already given to Mr. Lindahl and he does not object to me reading to the Court. I will note this is a summary of my investigator's conversation with Sergeant Patella.

2.

2.0

2.1

Jalen has a behavioral history of assaults against residents and staff. Patella says when Jalen first came in, he had a rocky start. He was very aggressive and started spiraling downward. Since the last major incident he had, he has been able to speak to Jalen and he began to see a change in him. He decided to put Jalen on a restrictive housing program that is actually not up and running yet; however, they currently have one inmate doing some of the programming and it has been recommended that Jalen be in the next enrollment. The housing department had a meeting about the program today — that being yesterday. The housing program teaches life skills, mindset changes, keeps inmates — excuse me, inmate activity involved, helps them understand their situation, psychological assistance, behavioral modification, as well as medication management. Although Jalen isn't

officially in the program, these are the things that have been used to help Jalen and he has done a great job in adjusting. His behavior has changed drastically. Jalen has fallen back into flying under the radar. Patella says now they are able to talk to Jalen and deescalate situations and calm him down. Jalen is focusing on getting himself together and not as aggressive anymore.

2.

2.1

I bring all of that up because I think it casts a more complete picture of where he is now and I think it also casts light on his prospects for future rehabilitation.

Mr. Jackson is not someone who's done time before. He's not someone who — his priors are, I believe, trespassing and a simple assault. He does have serious pending charge, and I will get into that in a moment. But I think the positive side here is though he went into jail not taking this situation seriously, still acting like a fool, to say the least, and I understand that is a minor way of characterizing his conduct, he has now gotten it.

I don't know that it ties to this, but I will note — and I won't go into the content, but I did have a conversation with him right around that time when he was in the hole and I hope that that may have contributed some to this. My regret — and I'm not blaming anyone for it. I'm just saying my regret here is that I wasn't notified that this was going on in there earlier and maybe I could have had that

conversation sooner. But I think it's notable not just that he behaved himself in the Mecklenburg County jail but also in the Irwin County Detention Center, and also we have — one of the people who's in the unit that he had previously been the most aggressive with who is genuinely saying he sees this person actually changing their behavior. I think this shows that even though we had a bad start, ultimately the process can work. Ultimately rehabilitation is available to Mr. Jackson. It took longer than it should have for him to get there, but he got there.

12.

2.0

2.1

THE COURT: Are these issues akin to any mental health concerns? And I ask that just as to whether the Court should recommend mental health treatment or even while on supervised release provide mental health assistance, or is it really just a matter of maturity and controlling yourself?

MR. DAVIS: I think it's largely maturity. I guess where I'm struggling is I think he could use anger management, and it seems like he's already gotten some of that and that has helped. That's a large — some of that is what has really helped him so far. I'm not sure if that's appropriately characterized as mental health treatment, but I do think that would be appropriate and a positive thing for him, particularly given that he seems to be amenable to it and he seems to take well to it.

I think that may segue well to the other aspect of

this, which is what I referred to earlier, the information in the presentence report regarding his dismissed and pending charges. The dismissed charges, there is, I think it's safe to say, an inherently unreliable description in court papers about charges that he was not convicted of. I know the Guide to Judiciary Policy acknowledges that as well when it advises PSR writers that since there is no reliable information about the facts, that those should only be noted to the Court to note previous encounters with law enforcement in that regard. I don't think — that's probably not terribly controversial to say, you know, that things he didn't get convicted of the Court shouldn't consider him to have done. I think that's probably pretty straightforward.

2.

12.

2.0

2.1

I think the bigger — the larger issue is, of course, the pending state charges which are very, very serious. The main thing that I have to take issue with in regard to the PSR, because I think it's obviously appropriate for the Court to be aware of what those charges are and what the allegations are, but the main issue I take with it is essentially the statements in the PSR that say that this was true, that say law enforcement did this, law enforcement did establish that he was involved. A better way of stating all of this and an accurate way of stating this would be according to the indictment or it is alleged that, because he vehemently denies any involvement in that.

In the previous hearing the Court alluded to some of the facts here, and I'll repeat them for this record. The pending charges against Mr. Jackson come — I have information about one of them. I don't really have much about the other, but they are related. A shooting incident where the victim of the shooting stated that he believed that the shooting incident came from disputes and disagreements that he had with Walter Jackson, Mr. Jackson's father. That he was one million percent sure that Walter Jackson drove the car involved in the shooting and that he was 70 percent sure that his son was with him. And I believe in a later statement he characterized that as unsure that his son was with him.

2.

12.

2.0

2.1

THE COURT: That's the way I recall the reports as well.

MR. DAVIS: I think it's fair to say that 70 percent sure is not beyond a reasonable doubt. And I don't mean to say that this is the entire case. A large part of the point I want to make is we shouldn't be having mini trials about these things in federal court and it puts us in a very difficult position when we have to address severely prejudicial facts like that without, you know, trying to have a mini trial on something that the government and the defense agree is not actually relevant conduct to this case.

And the reason I want to bring it up is because I wanted to, to some extent, unring the bell of the insinuation

that he's definitely guilty of this because I think that that is written into the PSR. Mr. Jackson does intend to contest those charges. I will relay to the Court that the state -- I haven't talked to Mr. Lindahl because there's no point in it. The state court did, through his state counsel, suggest that he could agree to more time in this case and they might drop those cases and he has refused that, so that's why I haven't even aired that to Mr. Lindahl.

12.

2.0

2.1

And we believe that the facts will show — I'd note for the Court — refer the Court to the employment section of the PSR, which I believe is paragraph 80, that notes that from July of 2020 until his arrest — I'm sorry, that's not the appropriate paragraph.

THE COURT: It is 80. It refers to his employment.

MR. DAVIS: Oh, yes, you're correct, Your Honor.
But it is actually 71 that has the information I'm referring to which notes that he resided in Wilkesboro, North Carolina, from July 2020 until his arrest. I was confused there because he was in Wilkesboro for work which is why I made that mistake. These events happened in August and September of 2020. We believe — it's my understanding, I should say. It's not my case and my knowledge of the facts is high level. But my understanding is it is their belief that they will be able to establish that he was not present at the time of this — that these events occurred.

THE COURT: Well, I think the way that I'll handle this, I will not consider the dismissed conduct and neither will I consider the pending charges. My way to address that will be just the sentence imposed in this case will be ordered to run consecutive to any other sentence. So if the state court resolves it to justice's satisfaction that he committed those offenses, then he'll be separately punished for that, but he won't be punished for that in this case.

2.

2.0

2.1

MR. DAVIS: I think that's a fair resolution, Your Honor.

And the final — well, second to final thing that I'd like to discuss is the influence of his father in regards to this case. And I expect there's — I'm sure his father would not agree, but I think the criminal records speak for themselves. Walter Jackson has a lengthy criminal record of assaultive behavior. Jalen Jackson has a trespass and a simple assault and is a criminal history category I. I think that in many ways speaks for itself. This is someone who did not have his father in his life for most of his life. And then his father is the one who initially sets up these deals, who is present for all of them, who makes sure that he, as a felon, is not the one handling the firearms himself, that it is Jalen Jackson.

And I'm not minimizing Jalen's involvement. He was obviously a part of this and full in, and he certainly, you

know, texted with agents himself. I don't mean that in any way to imply that he was not a full part of these transactions. He was.

2.

2.1

But I think — it is certainly difficult to say that he would — that this person, this criminal history category I person would have been here doing these things if he didn't have this father figure with his violent bad criminal record coming back into his life and strongly influencing him. That relationship has deteriorated, it's fair to say. I don't think that that is a risk in the future.

Under all of the circumstances — oh, the final thing I do want to note is he would request placement in a BOP facility — he has reached out to me about programs that he is interested in that have training in automotive technology and he's also interested in a CDL — as close to Charlotte as possible. I know Butner has those programs, but I would just say as close to Charlotte as possible.

THE COURT: I think I just recommended that his father be incarcerated at Butner, so we don't want to do that.

MR. DAVIS: Maybe just as close as possible with those programs.

THE COURT: Yeah, I wish we had done this in different order because I know Butner does have an automotive program and a CDL, but all right.

MR. DAVIS: And I just want to note that he did --

you know, he unilaterally reached out to me to ask about it and to research it himself. We try to talk about it, but he was the one who initiated all of that conversation, which I think is a very good sign for where he is headed in the future.

12.

2.0

2.1

So like I said at the beginning of this, I came in here wanting to ask for a downward variance. I still think this is a very substantial sentence. I don't know — I have to acknowledge that the things in the Mecklenburg County jail did happen and even though it does seem that he's come a long way since then, they did happen, that's real, and I'm not sure that it's appropriate for me to ask for a variance in light of that. I would still ask the Court in consideration of all the circumstances to consider something at the low end of the quidelines.

THE COURT: Let me ask about this. Obviously he didn't — he's under no legal obligation to assist the government, but he didn't. Is there some reason for that? I mean, the Court would prefer if it was in a position to reward cooperation, but obviously it's not. And then if you want to tie that in, is there any concern about perhaps the lack of complete acceptance of responsibility because he entered a straight-up plea without a plea agreement to two counts but not five others? Is that a failure to accept responsibility for that other conduct?

1 MR. DAVIS: No, Your Honor. I think actually 2. originally -- I think that was actually basically between 3 Mr. Lindahl and I. There was a plea offer that was -- I don't 4 know how much we want to go into this. 5 MR. LINDAHL: I can answer that quickly, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: I can kind of guess. 7 It had no impact on Mr. Jackson's MR. LINDAHL: 8 acceptance. We just decided that two counts perhaps 9 simplified the process and that was the straight-up plea. 10 THE COURT: I can pretty well guess how that 11 conversation went, so... 12 I mean, the only thing that I will MR. DAVIS: 13 offer, and I will -- without -- I guess I will observe this 14 from outside of the attorney/client relationship rather than 15 speaking from inside of it. Clearly in this case the 16 co-defendant is his father and I think that is probably the 17 best insight that I can express to the Court in that regard. 18 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 19 Mr. Jackson, you have the right to address the Court 20 if you would like to, but you don't have to say anything. 2.1 THE DEFENDANT: Oh, yeah, this will be the last time 22 you see me, Your Honor. That's all I really wanted to say. 23 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 24 Mr. Lindahl. 25 MR. LINDAHL: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, the government is asking for a sentence of 84 months in this case, 7 years. I believe that's the appropriate term.

Your Honor, if I were to assess the culpability of Jalen and Walter Jackson in this case, I would assess it as equal. Mr. Jalen Jackson was often the one wielding the firearms during these transactions. Walter Jackson was the one who originally connected with the confidential informant that got the ball rolling. I do believe that they are equally culpable for the sales that occurred.

Of course, the major distinction between the two would be criminal history. Mr. Jalen Jackson is a very young man. He comes before the Court with essentially a very minimal history. And Your Honor does have information, though, that can go toward his history and characteristics. That information does include what's set forth at paragraph 64, but I understand the Court's position on that.

I will say because of the overlap in our two hearings, with the Court's permission, I would go ahead and tender Government's 1 for this hearing to complete the record as well. And I can file that independently after the hearing since Your Honor reviewed it in the other case.

MR. DAVIS: No objection.

THE COURT: All right.

(Government's Exhibit Number 1 was received into

evidence.)

12.

2.0

2.1

MR. LINDAHL: Thank you, Your Honor.

And I'd also obviously bring up the sentencing memorandum that was filed by the government in this case that reflects very troubling conduct. I'm sure it is infrequent, if not the first time, that Your Honor has ever experienced a scenario where a defendant is ordered detained and commits a felony offense or allegedly commits a felony offense in the state of North Carolina during that detention. It's extremely troubling conduct that I believe bears directly on the characteristics of the defendant and, in large measure, suggests that he poses a risk to the public when he's released. This kind of behavior suggests as much. It's erratic, it's violent, it's threatening, and it shows very low regard for other individuals that he's encountering. So I believe it bears a significant relevance on Your Honor's ultimate decision today.

The offense, I've spoken about it already in our earlier hearing. I'll just reiterate. Sawed off shotguns that are easier to conceal. Obliterated serial numbers that by this defendant's own admission make them less traceable. Magazines, extended magazine, one drum magazine that was capable of holding 101 rounds. This is extremely serious conduct and quite an offense — if it were one of the first Mr. Jalen Jackson were to commit, quite an offense, quite

troubling offense conduct to commit with such a limited history and at such a young age.

So, Your Honor, we are asking that the Court consider all of that in fashioning an appropriate sentence. And again, would submit that 84 months, toward the high end of the range but not the high end, would be the appropriate sentence in this case.

Thank you.

2.0

2.1

THE COURT: Well, much to think about here, as there is in most cases really.

When the Court considers the seriousness of the offense, and I think I've said this in prior gun trafficking cases, this is an incredibly serious offense. I mean, this country is drowning in blood right now with shootings and indiscriminate violence that's taking place, and nearly all of it is with guns that are illegally acquired. And the types of weapons, as Mr. Lindahl described, are particularly concerning: Sawed off shotguns, obliterated serial numbers, which the only reason for that is so that when they're seized in connection with a crime, nobody can trace it back. That is conduct worthy of serious imprisonment.

The need to deter is sort of a two-way street here.

The Court wants the sentence to deter others, obviously. And

I wish that the word would get out that drug -- I mean, excuse

me, gun trafficking is not going to be profitable and will be

severely punished.

2.1

But I want to deter you as well, Mr. Jackson. I heard what you said, I'll be the last judge you will ever see, and I hope that's true. You are a young man. And given how tough your childhood was, to get to this point without a serious criminal record is unusual and to your credit. You're going to get a significant sentence here and I hope that's enough to persuade you that that's not how you want to spend the rest of your life. You're going to be whatever it is, maybe 30 years old or early 30s, when this is over; and that's a young man, but a man that needs to take care of himself after that.

I am concerned about the need to protect the public from you, frankly. I hear what your lawyer said about the explanations and improvement of your time in jail, but that doesn't give me much confidence that the community is safe from you when you're out in the community. I'm glad that it's improved. That's encouraging. We're going to try to get you some anger management help while you're in custody and while you're on supervised release. And hopefully the difference between being 24 and 30 will make a difference. They say it does. But the sentence needs to protect the public from you, at least for a good little while.

I do believe that the Court needs to pay a little bit of attention to avoiding unwarranted sentence disparities

here. I wish that I had a little more flexibility on your sentencing with a motion from the government because of your assistance. I understand that I guess you didn't want to assist against your father, although there was this other person you could have easily assisted against. Your father didn't have any hesitancy in cooperating. And his criminal history is so much worse than yours and I believe that your offense conduct here is the same as his. But my guess is that you would not have been involved in this but for him. And his sentence this morning was — make sure I get this right — was 90 months. And as I say, his criminal history is so much worse than yours. I need to keep you significantly under that because of that, but then still do all the other things that I'm suggesting.

2.

12.

2.0

2.1

All right. So pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 and *U.S. versus Booker*, it is the order of the Court, having considered all the factors in 3553(a), that the defendant is hereby committed to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 72 months on count one — excuse me, 60 months on count one and 72 months on count four to be served concurrently. This sentence is to be served consecutively to any other sentence imposed after this date.

The Court recommends that he be incarcerated at a facility as close to Charlotte as possible that offers

vocational training in automotive and CDL, but not Butner.

2.0

2.1

The Court recommends that he be allowed to participate in any anger management treatment programs while incarcerated and that he be allowed to participate in any other educational and vocational opportunities while incarcerated.

Upon release from imprisonment, defendant shall be placed on supervised release for a term of three years. This term consists of three years on each of counts one and four to be served concurrently.

Within 72 hours of release from the Bureau of Prisons, you are to report in person to the probation office in the district into which you are released.

While on supervised release, you shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime, and shall comply with each of the discretionary conditions of supervised release that have been adopted by this Court. Objections to those conditions have been withdrawn. The Court has considered the appropriateness of each of them with respect to your case and finds that each of them is necessary and appropriate to serve the goals that are appropriate for supervised release.

As a special condition of supervised release, the defendant shall participate in an anger management treatment program and the probation officer shall supervise the participation in that program.

It is ordered that defendant pay the United States a special assessment of \$200.

2.0

2.1

The Court finds that he does not have the ability to pay a fine and no fine will be imposed. Are there any forfeiture issues here?

MR. LINDAHL: No, Your Honor. Just like the last case, disposition has been filed.

THE COURT: Would the Court move to dismiss the remaining counts -- I mean, excuse me --

MR. LINDAHL: Yes, Your Honor, the government would so move. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. The Court will grant that.

Mr. Jackson, you can appeal your conviction if you believe that your guilty plea was somehow unlawful or involuntary or if there is some other fundamental defect in these proceedings. You also have the right to appeal your sentence under certain circumstances, particularly if you believe it's contrary to law. Any notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of entry of the Court's judgment. If you're unable to afford the cost of appeal, if you ask, the clerk of court will prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf at no cost to you.

I suggest you discuss these rights with your attorney, but do you understand them as I have explained them to you?

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 2 THE COURT: All right. Then this matter is 3 concluded. Mr. Jackson is remanded to the custody of the 4 marshal. Good luck to you, sir. 5 MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, I'm sorry. 6 THE COURT: Yes. 7 MR. DAVIS: Before you do conclude, may I suggest one minor modification to the placement recommendation? 8 9 THE COURT: Yes. 10 MR. DAVIS: Since we don't know for sure -- you 11 know, BOP does what BOP does. May I suggest modifying the not 12 Butner to being not the same facility as his father, so that 13 if they put his father somewhere else, he still would have 14 that available. 15 THE COURT: Yes, I'll be glad to make that 16 modification. I never know how much my recommendations carry 17 with the Bureau of Prisons, but I would have no prohibition on 18 this defendant being incarcerated at Butner so long as his 19 father is not there. 20 MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Your Honor. 2.1 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 22 Mr. Jackson, I hope no judge ever does see you 23 again. 24 THE DEFENDANT: I appreciate it, Your Honor. 25 MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Davis. 2 (End of proceedings at 10:27 AM.) 3 **** UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 4 5 WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA 6 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 7 8 9 I, Cheryl A. Nuccio, Federal Official Realtime Court 10 Reporter, in and for the United States District Court for the 11 Western District of North Carolina, do hereby certify that 12 pursuant to Section 753, Title 28, United States Code, that 13 the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the 14 stenographically reported proceedings held in the 15 above-entitled matter and that the transcript page format is 16 in conformance with the regulations of the Judicial Conference 17 of the United States. 18 19 Dated this 18th day of July 2024. 20 21 22 s/Cheryl A. Nuccio Cheryl A. Nuccio, RMR-CRR 23 Official Court Reporter 24 25